



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

for. Pope Paul IV., who in 1555 "had apparently desired to show that Rome was not to be outdone by Geneva in persecuting rigor and that, if Calvin in 1553 had burnt Servet for denying the Trinity, he could be equally zealous for the faith," and had decreed by a general bull that "all who denied the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, his conception through the Holy Ghost, his death for human salvation, or the perpetual virginity of the Virgin, and who did not confess to inquisitors and abjure their errors within three months, and all who in future should maintain those heresies," should forthwith suffer the penalty of relapsed heretics, bestowed in 1559 on the Spanish Inquisition the further power of dealing thus with all heretics counted dangerous or insincere.

Yet Mr. Lea is inclined to think the importance of the Protestant movement in Spain to have been greatly exaggerated. "There never", he says (p. 411), "was the slightest real danger that Protestantism could make such permanent impression on the profound and unreasoning religious convictions of Spain in the sixteenth century, as to cause disturbance in the body politic; and the excitement created in Valladolid and Seville, in 1558 and 1559, was a mere passing episode leaving no trace in popular beliefs." But it "raised [the Inquisition] to new life and importance and gave it a claim on the gratitude of the State, which enabled it to dominate the land during the seventeenth century"; and it "served as a reason for isolating Spain from the rest of Europe, excluding all foreign ideas, arresting the development of culture and of science, and prolonging mediævalism into modern times". Something similar might doubtless be said of the influence of heresy as a whole; for to the end, as the documents appended to this volume abundantly prove, heresy properly so called played but a minor and a dwindling part in the actual business of the Inquisition.

GEORGE L. BURR.

*The Cambridge Modern History.* Planned by the late LORD ACTON, LL.D. Edited by A. W. WARD, Litt.D., G. W. PROTHERO, Litt.D., and STANLEY LEATHES, M.A. Volume IV. *The Thirty Years' War.* (Cambridge: University Press; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1906. Pp. xxix, 1003.)

It may well seem unnecessary to discuss further the general plan and character of the *Cambridge Modern History*. But before proceeding to the examination of this latest volume from the standpoint of the editorial plans and the standards set by the preceding issues, the present reviewer would like to express his belief that the tendency heretofore strongly shown to use this work as an argument against co-operative undertakings in the field of history has gone a little too far, and that the criticism of the editorial supervision has been at times too exacting. With regard to the judgment of co-operative undertakings it is perhaps worth recalling that there are at least two leading sorts, and that the sort to which the Cambridge work belongs is to be sharply distinguished

from the class of "Einzeldarstellungen" of which the "Oncken" and the "American Nation" series are the best-known examples. In this latter class each author is put practically in possession of a comparatively distinct field and works under but slightly different conditions than if he were publishing in entire independence; it is a form that would seem capable of effective use even in limited fields with regard to *Kulturgeschichte*. The other class is that to which the present series belongs and of which before it the *Histoire Générale* of Lavisse and Rambaud was the chief example; here the writers really more or less collaborate in limited periods, each furnishing but a spoke of the wheel, presenting as a specialist but a small section of the results of studies presumably covering more or less the whole period. Thus it might be hoped, not only would there be secured for each section the great weight of greater specialization, but there would be also focussed on the whole period or on the main movements in it illumination from different quarters and elevations. With regard to undertakings of this kind the reviewer is inclined to think that too much is looked for usually from the editorial supervision. The work must of course be carefully planned and apportioned, dovetailed in some degree; but why should there be great objection to a reasonable amount of iteration or to the appearance of differing and even conflicting views? It may be contended that the editor who ruthlessly excludes such duplicating statements or who strives to harmonize conclusions or even statements of fact will really mutilate and emasculate. The space saved will be but slight; and the reader who needs to be preserved from the terrible danger of being confronted within the same covers with differing views or even different statements of fact has probably too frail an intellectual existence to be at large at all in the rarefied atmosphere of specialization. The work of the specialist under such conditions is at best irritating and unsatisfactory; it becomes the more so with rigorous editorial efforts to secure an impossible (and probably undesirable) "unity."

The present reviewer, then, while strongly deplored the very apparent limitations in the views and plans of the editors of the *Cambridge Modern History*, is not wholly in accord with some of the complaints against earlier volumes of their work. And it seems to him further that the chances of usefulness of these volumes have not been sufficiently recognized. Even the expert in this or that period may find these brief and usually very meaty statements useful in bringing together conveniently the methods and conclusions of other experts; the real student who is not an expert can see readily what stage has been reached in the knowledge of the period and will welcome the variety of standpoints and opinions. From the point of view of the general reader or the elementary student the paucity of trustworthy work in English must be kept in mind; certainly these volumes will be of great use to the university teacher in modern history, while the serious general reader cannot easily be directed to more satisfactory political or military narratives.

The present volume deals with a period of unusual vigor and complexity of entanglements—a period then peculiarly ill-adapted to successful co-operative treatment. The space assigned is liberal, 799 pages being given to the period 1610–1660. This is nearly double that given in the *Histoire Générale*; but as there is considerable divergence in the plans of volume and topic division, it is not easy to compare the two works directly. The *Histoire Générale* list of topics seems at first glance the more comprehensive, but this is due mainly to the different lines of division. Thus the *Cambridge History* gives absolutely no space in this volume to Eastern Europe (to which volume V. of the *Histoire Générale* gives four chapters); on the other hand there are here two excellent chapters on Scandinavia, a field that is deferred by the *Histoire Générale* to the volume on the age of Louis XIV. A disproportionate amount of space we are prepared to find assigned in the *Cambridge* volume to British conditions (250 pp.); we should not complain if it were not for the inclusion of one entirely superfluous chapter (Mr. Clutton-Brock's "The Fantastic School of English Poetry", dealing with the age of Donne and Herbert). *Kulturgeschichte* fares rather badly in both works; but while the general treatment of Art and Science in the *Histoire Générale* may seem to promise more, Professor Boutroux's chapter in the *Cambridge* on "Descartes and Cartesianism" is both better in itself and more in line with the plan of treatment. As to method and style, the French work maintains a clear superiority, most of the sections in the English being below its average in clarity, attractiveness, and sense of proportion. The greater bulk of the present volume is due to the almost unrestrained yielding to the tendency to encyclopedic detail that has marked the whole undertaking; whether designed or not, there can be no doubt that the editors secure a painful uniformity in this respect at least. There is evidently no chance of reform on the point; but we need not therefore shut our eyes to the fact that encyclopedic detail is often very useful, and that in almost every case these dry and close-packed pages are marked by a high degree of accuracy and scholarly grasp.

The chief section of the book is constituted by Professor Ward's able treatment of the war as a whole, in its narrower sense; thorough as is the writer's grasp of the field, he has little gift of narration, leaves no vivid impressions of either men or events, and casts no new light on problems. The closing chapter, "The Peace of Westphalia", is however in all likelihood the best statement to be found in our language of the development and the results of the long negotiations. Next in importance (slightly larger in space) comes the section devoted to Great Britain and Ireland, 1625–1660; Dr. Prothero, an acknowledged master in the field, does the most of it, and is ably helped by W. A. Shaw, J. R. Tanner, Hume Brown, R. Dunlop, and C. H. Firth. While we may perhaps be surprised that this part of the broth should have required so many cooks, we cannot cavil much at the carrying on of the collabora-

tion. It would seem also as if the comparatively slight connections with continental events were more carefully and skilfully presented than is usually the case. France falls to the third editor, Mr. Leathes, who on the whole makes a strikingly good use of the limited seventy pages assigned; he is more successful in his treatment of detail than most of his associates, and is both clear and suggestive. A striking feature of his statement is his adverse judgment of Richelieu, whose title to greatness is strongly questioned. He is denied "creative and beneficent statesmanship", and is credited with establishing a "lawless despotism" that brings on the Revolution; he had never comprehended the "true bases of national prosperity", and "had revealed to the French monarchy the weakness of all those traditional and conventional restraints which had limited the power of earlier Kings for good, and more especially for evil" (p. 157).

Interspersed between the sections of these main studies come the chapters dealing with minor fields. First there is the uneven treatment by H. F. Brown of "The Valtelline". This is absurdly detailed in the first part of the period and scanty in the later; Mr. Brown's ingenious defense of his detail on the ground of the reflection by the Valtelline factions of the policies and efforts of the great states is decidedly weakened by his admission that most of the complexity was caused by the efforts of these factions to sell out to the highest bidder. A similar war of factions seems to be responsible for most of the detail in which Mr. Reddaway luxuriates in the first part of his treatment of Scandinavia; from the accession of Gustavus Adolphus, however, the work is remarkably good. Mr. Hume's chapter on Spain is of course excellent, notwithstanding its rather naïve display of the "*inédit*" and its neglect of the Spanish contributions to the war in Germany (not dealt with by Ward). The presentation of the Papal policy by Brosch brings out clearly the controlling motives, but is likely to be criticized for a somewhat too pronounced Protestant tone, as in the statement that with the success of the Catholic Powers 1627–1629 "the whole of modern civilisation and the continuous development of learning would have been forcibly stopped, and that for no short time" (p. 677). Mr. Edmundson's Holland is excellent; he is to be given the credit of being almost the only contributor who gives adequate attention to intellectual conditions, even though we may suspect him of going too far in ascribing to the Dutch in this their Golden Age "a supremacy in the domains of science, of learning, of letters, and of the arts, as indisputable as their supremacy upon the seas" (p. 716). The treatment of colonial development by Egerton is much too detailed and is injured by too rigorous keeping within the prescribed time limits. The closing chapter by Boutroux on Descartes has been already mentioned; it leaves us with an increased regret that the writers did not see fit to sacrifice some of the political and military detail in order to secure room for other things.

The bibliography appended to this volume is much more extensive

than in any of the others (pp. 801-953); this we are told by the editors is exceptional and is due to an intention to do honor to Lord Acton by utilizing the collection of his books presented by Mr. Carnegie to John Morley and by Mr. Morley to Cambridge University in compiling "a full bibliography of the Thirty Years' War, and more especially of its extant original documents and contemporary narrative and controversial literature". Only the specialist can venture to criticize this effort. But it naturally suggests the thought that the editors in the bibliographies of the other volumes seem to be occupying rather untenable ground in giving more than the average student needs and not enough for the specialist.

VICTOR COFFIN.

*English Local Government from the Revolution to the Municipal Corporations Act: The Parish and the County.* By SIDNEY and BEATRICE WEBB. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1906. Pp. xxv, 664.)

At last the local constitutional history of England is receiving the treatment which it deserves as compared with the history of the national organization. This book is epoch-making. The completed work as planned by the authors will constitute a veritable *magnum opus* both in scope and in quality, to judge by this splendid installment. It is to comprise at least five volumes, grouped in two general divisions. The first division, in three volumes, deals with the "constitutional form and the administrative procedure of the various kinds of local governing authorities"; and the second, in two volumes, with "the action of all these authorities in respect to the various functions entrusted to Local Government." Hitherto the attention of original investigators has been confined mainly to the Anglo-Saxon and early feudal periods of English local institutions. Regarding some of the more important problems of the early history, in articles, monographs, and in books dealing with the national constitution, much good work has already been accomplished. Even for those times, however, there exists no authoritative or sustained "local constitutional history" based on a full use of the sources; while for the modern development the only general treatise has been Dr. H. Rudolph von Gneist's *Selbstgovernment, Kommunalverfassung und Verwaltungsgeschichte*, first published in 1857 and finally revised in 1871. It is highly significant of the extreme indifference of English scholars to one of the richest fields of research that this important book has found no translator. Yet, able and erudite as is Gneist's celebrated work, in reality it is merely a legal history based mainly on the public statutes and parliamentary papers. Little use has been made of the private acts and none at all of the manuscript records of the various administrative and governing bodies.

The present volume represents an enormous amount of labor. With the aid of a number of trained assistants, the authors were engaged upon